IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR.

O R D E R.

1-Mumtaz Ali Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 3127/2006)
2-Kesrilal Ji Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 6642/2006
3-Sardar Paramjeet Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 6641/2006)
4-Chauthmal Jain Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 6618/2006)
5-Yusuf Ali Vs. State of Rajasthan and ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 4997/2006)
6-Manoj Kumar Jain Vs. State of Rajasthan and ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 6619/2006)
7-Devilal Kushwah alias Devi Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 6643/2006)
8-Taslim Bhai Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 4995/2006)
9-Mehmood Ali Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 4996/2006)
10-Yakub Khan Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 4998/2006)
11-Krishna Kant Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 4999/2006)
12-Fahim Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 5666/2006)
13-Narendra Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.
(SB Civil Writ Petition No. 5667/2006)

Date of Order ::::: 06/10/2006

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ASHOK PARIHAR.

Mr. Davendra Raghava, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ajeet Bhandari, for the respondents.

Since on similar set of facts same prayers have been made, all the writ petitions have been heard together and are being decided by this common order.

The petitioners are aggrieved by the resolution passed by the Municipal Board Jhalara Patan by which for development and construction of new Bus Stand the existing shopkeepers were to be removed and rehabilitated as per proposal and plan of the Town Planning Department.

Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the allotment already made to the petitioners could not have been cancelled as they had made huge investment for construction of their shops. It has also been submitted that in stead of development of Bus Stand, the respondents may utilize the land for other commercial purpose.

Learned counsel for the respondents on the other hand submitted that it was only after due consideration the general body of the Board has passed the resolution on the basis of necessary reports from the Town Planning Department. It has also been alleged that some of the original allottees have already transferred the shops to other persons without any permission of the Board and are not doing their business at the present place.

Be that as it may, since the Municipal Board is competent to take a resolution to cancel the allotment in the larger interest of the public and further in the present matter the rehabilitation scheme has already been framed, in the facts and circumstances, no interference is called for by this Court in such matters under writ jurisdiction.

The writ petitions are dismissed accordingly as having no merits.

(Ashok Parihar), J.